

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-4, 6-11, 14, 15 and 17-21 are pending in the above-identified application. No new matter is entered. It is respectfully submitted that this paper is fully responsive to the Office action mailed on October 5, 2009.

**Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. §103**

Claims 1, 2, 6, 8-10, and 21 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as unpatentable over ATTAR et al. (US 2004/0179469) in view of IINUMA (US 7,075,909).

Applicants disagree with the Examiner's characterization of the cited references and the pending claim language. Thus, Applicants request favorable reconsideration of this rejection in view of the following remarks.

Regarding claim 1, the Examiner acknowledged that ATTAR does not disclose: *the set of communication stations including a plurality of said communicating stations*. However, the Examiner asserted that INUMA discloses this feature (Abstract; col. 2, lines 30-48; col. 16, lines 38-41, a set of mobile stations assigned each time slot). The Examiner concluded that it would be obvious to modify ATTAR to use the technique of assigning more than one user to a time slot in order to increase efficiency of frequency use.

However, “[a]n examiner must provide clear explanations for all actions taken by the examiner during prosecution of an application.” MPEP 707.07(f) (The examiner should “take note of the applicant’s argument and answer the substance of it.”) However, in this Office Action, the Examiner failed to address the substance of Applicants’ remarks provided in the

April 27, 2009 Amendment. Instead, the Examiner only addressed the added limitation (*i.e.*, “...*the set of communication stations including a plurality of said communication stations*”). Accordingly, Applicants request that the Examiner provide a clear explanation in accordance with MPEP 707.07(f).

Furthermore, Applicants requests favourable reconsideration in view of the reasons discussed below (and presented in Applicant’s previous Amendment.)

The ATTAR reference does not disclose a time slot assignment section 101, as described in claim 1. In particular, paragraph [0020] expressly discloses: “At each time-slot, data transmission occurs from an access point to one and only one access terminal... .” This teaches away from the claimed invention, which recites that “the set of communication stations (includes) a plurality of said communication stations.” *See* claim 1. Accordingly, a person of ordinary skill in the art would not be motivated to combine the cited references in the manner suggested by the Examiner.

Nevertheless, even if one were to combine the cited references, the result would not be the claimed invention. None of the cited references discloses “when the time-synchronous communication section transmits a time-synchronous communication frame to each communication station in the set of communication stations, time of the timer section of each communication station and the time slots of all stations in the set of communication stations are synchronized.” Specifically, paragraph [0135] of the ATTAR reference only discloses that the timing of the access points and access terminals is synchronized (*e.g.*, the communication station is synchronized.) Thus, the claimed invention is not obvious in view of the cited references.

Accordingly, Applicants request that the obviousness rejection directed towards claims 1, 2, 6, 8-10, and 21 be withdrawn.

Claims 3 and 4 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over A&I as applied to claim 1 above further in view of WU et al. (US 2003/0110435).

Claims 7, 11, 14, and 15 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over A&I as applied in claim 1 above in view of HAARSTEN (USPN 6,021,124) further in view of HADZIC et al. (US 20040062278).

Claims 17-20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over A&I as applied to claim 1 above in view of YONG et al. (USPN 5,541,919).

Claims 3, 4, 7, 11, 14, 15, and 17-20 depend from independent claim 1. Accordingly, Applicants request favorable reconsideration of these claims in view of the remarks above distinguishing independent claim 1.

### **Conclusion**

In view of the aforementioned remarks, Applicants submit that the claims are in condition for allowance. Applicants request such action at an early date.

If the Examiner believes that this application is not now in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to contact Applicants' undersigned attorney to arrange for an interview to expedite the disposition of this case.

Application No. 10/584,106  
Art Unit: 2461

Response under 37 C.F.R. §1.116  
Attorney Docket No. 091611

If this paper is not timely filed, Applicants respectfully petition for an appropriate extension of time. The fees for such an extension or any other fees that may be due with respect to this paper may be charged to Deposit Account No. 50-2866.

Respectfully submitted,  
**WESTERMAN, HATTORI, DANIELS & ADRIAN, LLP**

/DARRIN A. AUTO/

Darrin A. Auito  
Attorney for Applicants  
Registration No. 56,024  
Telephone: (202) 822-1100  
Facsimile: (202) 822-1111

DAA/rer